On CRP rings

Tai Keun Kwak Daejin University *Email*: tkkwak@daejin.ac.kr

We study the one-sided regularity of matrices in upper triangular matrix rings in relation with the structure of diagonal entries. We consider next a ring theoretic condition that ab being regular implies ba being also regular for elements a, b in a given ring. Rings with such a condition are said to be *commutative at regular product* (simply, *CRP* rings). CRP rings are shown to be contained in the class of directly finite rings, and we prove that if R is a directly finite ring that satisfies the descending chain condition for principal right ideals or principal left ideals, then R is CRP. We obtain in particular that the upper triangular matrix rings over commutative rings are CRP.

References

- D.D. Anderson, V. Camillo, Semigroups and rings whose zero products commute, Comm. Algebra 27 (1999), 2847-2852.
- 2. R. Antoine, Nilpotent elements and Armendariz rings, J. Algebra 319 (2008), 3128-3140.
- 3. R. Baer, Inverses and zero-divisors, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 48 (1942), 630-638.
- H.E. Bell, Near-rings in which each element is a power of itself, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. 2 (1970), 363–368.
- 5. C. Huh, H.K. Kim, Y. Lee, p.p. rings and generalized p.p. rings, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 167 (2002), 37–52.
- 6. C. Huh, N.K. Kim, Y. Lee, Examples of strongly π -regular rings, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 189 (2004), 195–210.
- C. Huh, Y. Lee, A. Smoktunowicz, Armendariz rings and semicommutative rings, Comm. Algebra 30 (2002), 751–761.
- S.U. Hwang, N.K. Kim, Y. Lee, On rings whose right annihilators are bounded, Glasgow Math. J. 51 (2009), 539–559.
- 9. N. Jacobson, Some remarks on one-sided inverses, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 1 (1950), 352-355.
- Y.C. Jeon, H.K. Kim, Y. Lee, J.S. Yoon, On weak Armendariz rings, Bull. Korean Math. Soc. 46 (2009), 135–146.
- D.W. Jung, N.K. Kim, Y. Lee, S.P. Yang, Nil-Armendariz rings and upper nilradicals, Int. J. Alg. Comp. 22 (2012), 1–13(1250059).
- J.C. Shepherdson, Inverses and zero-divisors in matrix ring, Proc. London Math. Soc. 3 (1951), 71–85.i